

REMARKS

Claims 1-29 were pending of which Claims 1, 2, 10, and 11 were rejected and Claims 3-9 were objected to and Claims 12-29 allowed, as described in the Detailed Action of the Office Action. Applicant notes that the Office Action Summary listed Claims 1, 2, 9 and 10 as being rejected and Claims 3-8 as being objected to, however, Applicant believes this is incorrect. Clarification is respectfully requested if this is not an error.

The Examiner objected to Claims 3-9 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but indicated that they would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 1 has been amended to include the subject matter of Claim 6 and Claim 6 has been cancelled. Claim 7 has been amended to remain dependent from the subject matter of Claim originally filed Claim 6. Thus, no new matter has been added in the claims.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-2, 10 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Grenda et al. (US 6,948,840) (“Grenda”). Applicant requests reconsideration.

As discussed above, Claim 1 has been amended to claim the subject matter of Claim 6, which the Examiner indicated was allowable if rewritten in independent form. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Claim 1 is now in condition for allowance. Claims 2-5 and 7-11 depend from Claim 1 and are therefore likewise in condition for allowance.

New Claims 30 and 31 are added. Independent Claim 30 recites “the transparent member is shaped such that light emitted from the at least one light emitting diode is directed toward the exit surface of the transparent member, wherein at least a portion of the light emitted from the first light emitting diode is reflected by the first light emitting diode after being reflected by the one of a second light emitting diode and a reflective coating on the second surface of the transparent member before exiting the exit surface of the transparent member.” Claim 30 is disclosed, e.g., in Fig. 2 and paragraph [0030] and Claim 31 is disclosed, e.g., in Fig. 5 and the accompanying text, and thus, no new matter is added. Applicant notes that Grenda does not disclose that the LED 22 (Fig. 1) or 52 (Fig. 3) reflects a portion of the light emitted by the LED after the light is reflected by either a second light emitting diode or a reflective coating on the second surface of the transparent member. Moreover, Claim 31 recites that there is a second light emitting diode is disposed on the

second surface of the transparent member. Grenda does not disclose a second light emitting diode reflecting a portion of the light emitted by the first light emitting diode. For example, in Fig. 3 of Grenda, the raised section 62 prevents light from one LED 52 from reaching the other LED 52. Thus, Applicant submits that Claims 30 and 31 are allowable.

Claims 1 and 7 have been amended and Claim 6 has been cancelled and Claims 30 and 31 are added leaving Claims 1-5, 7-31 pending. For the above reasons, Applicants respectfully request allowance of all pending claims. Should the Examiner have any questions concerning this response, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at (408) 982-8202.

**Via Express Mail Label No.
EV 652 161 614 US**

Respectfully submitted,



Michael J. Halbert
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 40,633

SILICON VALLEY
PATENT GROUP LLP

2350 Mission College Blvd.
Suite 360
Santa Clara, CA 95054
(408) 982-8200
FAX (408) 982-8210